

Mark A. Feller (SBN 319789)
mark.feller@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
 Tel: 415.442.1000

Melissa Hill (*pro hac vice*)
melissa.hill@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
 101 Park Avenue
 New York, NY 10178
 Tel: 212.309.6000

Sean K. McMahan (*pro hac vice*)
sean.mcmahan@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
 1717 Main Street, Suite 3200
 Dallas, TX 75201-7347
 Tel: 214.466.4000

Jared R. Killeen (*pro hac vice*)
jared.killeen@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
 2222 Market Street
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 Tel: 215.963.5000

*Attorneys for Defendants X Corp., f/k/a
 Twitter, Inc.; X Holdings; Elon Musk; and
 Does*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

COURTNEY MCMILLIAN and RONALD
 COOPER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

X CORP., f/k/a/ TWITTER, INC.,
 X HOLDINGS, ELON MUSK, Does,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
 PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO STRIKE REPLY IN
 SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE
 TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

Judge: Trina L. Thompson
 Magistrate Judge: Robert M. Illman

1 Defendants oppose Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to Strike Defendants' Reply in
 2 Support of Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief (Dkt. 83), and respectfully ask that the
 3 Court consider the Reply (Dkt. 82) and related filings (Dkts. 82-1 through 82-4).

4 Defendants filed the Reply on the same day Plaintiffs filed their Opposition to Defendants'
 5 Administrative Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Briefing in order to respond to Plaintiffs'
 6 incorrect assertion that "Defendants failed to meet and confer with Plaintiffs" before filing their
 7 Administrative Motion and address other issues raised by Plaintiffs' opposition. *See* Dkt. 81.
 8 Although Civil Local Rule 7-11(c) provides that a motion for administrative relief is "deemed
 9 submitted for immediate determination without hearing on the day after the opposition is due," the
 10 rule does not (as Plaintiffs suggest) expressly prohibit the filing of a reply, and the Court may
 11 consider such a reply in its discretion. *See, e.g., Tucker v. AstraZeneca Pharm., L.P.*, 2006 WL
 12 2092069, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 26, 2006) (considering reply in support of administrative motion);
 13 *Ingram v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.*, 2013 WL 5340697, at *1 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2013) (similar).

14 Defendants respectfully ask that the Court deny Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike, and consider
 15 the Reply and related filings when deciding Defendants' Administrative Motion for Leave to File
 16 Supplemental Briefing.

17
 18 Dated: April 25, 2024

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

19 By /s/ Melissa Hill

20 Melissa Hill (pro hac vice)
 21 Sean McMahan (pro hac vice)
 22 Jared R. Killeen (pro hac vice)
 23 Mark A. Feller

24 Attorneys for Defendants
 25
 26
 27
 28